

**REMARKS**

As an initial matter, Applicant's gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's determination that the present rejection would be overcome by adding a limitation that the two different liquids are ejected from different nozzles (Office Action dated June 20, 2007, p. 9). Claim 1 is amended to incorporate such a limitation, as supported by, *e.g.*, Fig. 6.

The present amendment adds no new matter and raises no new issues.

**The Rejections**

Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess et al. (EP 1 273 355) [hereinafter "Hess '355"] in view of Luginbuhl et al. (U.S. Patent 6,523,762) [hereinafter "Luginbuhl"] and Brown (U.S. Patent 5,526,957).

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Hess'355 and Luginbuhl and Brown, and further in view of Silverbrook (U.S. Patent 6,669,333).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess, Luginbuhl, and Brown.

Claims 5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess, Luginbuhl, and Brown, and further in view of Adachi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/ 0158952 A1) [hereinafter "Adachi"].

Claims 6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess, Luginbuhl, and Brown, and further in view of Koto (U.S. Patent 4,434,430).

Claims 7 and 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess, Luginbuhl, and Brown, and further in view of Hartman (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0085966 A1).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hess, Luginbuhl, and Brown, and further in view of Adachi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0107159) [hereinafter “Adachi”].

### **Applicants’ Arguments**

As admitted by the Examiner, the references fail to teach “at least two sub-spaces separated by a flexible but leak-tight separation, each sub-space containing a different liquid to be ejected through said nozzle membrane section, and wherein the different liquids are ejected from different outlet nozzles” as now recited by claim 1 (Office Action dated June 20, 2007, p. 9). Accordingly, for the reasons of record, the sole independent claim is patentable over the prior art (and thus all of the claims are so patentable), and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.


### **CONCLUSION**

For all of the above reasons, claims 1-7 and 9-19 are in condition for allowance and a prompt notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Questions are welcomed by the below-signed attorney for Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

*GRIFFIN & SZIPL, P.C.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joerg-Uwe Szimpl  
Registration No. 31,799

GRIFFIN & SZIPL, P.C.  
Suite PH-1  
2300 Ninth Street, South  
Arlington, VA 22204

Telephone: (703) 979-5700  
Facsimile: (703) 979-7429  
Email: [gands@szimpl.com](mailto:gands@szimpl.com)  
Customer No.: 24203